

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RICHARD PAUL CHAPMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES LONG; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-16233

D.C. No. CV-05-02065-FCD/JFM

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Frank C. Damrell, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 20, 2007^{**}

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Richard Paul Chapman, a former California state prisoner, appeals pro se

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. Thus, Chapman's request for oral argument is denied. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

from the district court’s judgment dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction his action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging constitutional violations in connection with a civil action brought against him in state court. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court’s jurisdictional dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly concluded that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bars Chapman’s civil rights action because it is a “forbidden de facto appeal from a judicial decision of a state court,” and raises constitutional claims that are “inextricably intertwined” with that prior state court decision. *Id.* at 1158.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Chapman’s motion for reconsideration because Chapman failed to demonstrate grounds warranting relief from the judgment. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993).

AFFIRMED.